00088061

OKI
891·21
Mah/Att
88061

00088061

Digitized with financial assistance from

Ms.Swati Thakar

on 13 March, 2020

WITH PERMISSION,

AT THE FEET OF HIS HIGHNESS

S'RIMANT

SAYAJIRAV GAYKAVAD,

A MARATHA KSHATRIYA,

the most enlightened Maharaja

(OF BARODA),

THIS LITERARY TRIBUTE NO. II

is most respectfully placed

BY THE AUTHOR

RAJARAM RAMKRISHNA BHAGAWAT,

A Maratha Brahmin (of British India).

"There is not (anything) higher than the warrior class, therefore (even) a Brahmin occupies in the Râja-sûya (sacrifice) a seat below the king, there-by (the Brahmin) bestows glory on the warrior class alone."—11, 4, I, Bṛihad Âraṇyaka Upanishad.

"Who, indeed, circulate here their contempt for us, they do know something, (but) this attempt (of mine is) not for them; (there) will be born (or) is (already born) one, having tastes identical with mine, because the Time (is) endless, and the earth (is) vast."—Bhava-bhûti, the greatest Dramatist of classical times in his Mâlatî-Mâdhava.

Divings into Bhagavad-gita.

Original Bhagavad-gita unearthed.

THESE TWO TRACTS WILL BE SENT FREE TO ANY

ADDRESS IN INDIA

BY

R. R. BHAGAWAT,

St. Xavier's College, Esplanade, Bombay

on receipt of one half-anna stamp.

An attempt to analyse the Maha-Bharata

(From the higher Brahminical stand-point).

28 C.

B 228

BY

RAJARAM RAMKRISHNA BHAGAWAT,

St. Xavier's College, Esplanade, Bombay.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

88061

BOMBAY:

Printed at the "Native" Press, 92, Khotachi Wadi, Girgaum.

1905.

Exa-9-7

Price Annas 4 (four), postage ½ anna.

To be had of

Messrs RAMCHANDRA GOVIND & SON,

Book-sellers and Publishers, 147, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.

Opinions on the Wilson Philological Lectures.

Dr. A. F. Hoernle, Oxford—

"They show how much thought you have given to the subject, and that you have been led to the adoption of very curiously original ideas upon it .... It is gratifying, however, to find an Indian scholar devoting such close and unprejudiced study to the subject."

Dr. J. Hale'vy, Paris—

"Vous y avez emmagasiné tous les résultats de la philologie européenne et vous y avez ajouté de remarques précieuses puisées a des sources moins accessibles."

Writing again on 31st, December, 1904—

"Les mémoires sont de la plus haute importance pour la littérature indienne. Vous y avez reuni les vastes connaissances de l'érudit aux argumentations claires et décisives du penseur."

Dr. (Theol) L. H. Mills, Translator of Zoroastrian Gathas, Oxford—

"They will be effective in the examination of the great problems with which they deal."

Sir M. M. Bhownuggree M.P., G.K.C.S.I., London—

"You have, as far as a layman like myself can judge, treated it comprehensively and feel that the Lectures ought to prove of much value to those engaged in the study of Sanskrit.....That portion of your work where you deal with the Gâthâ-Avestic Races and Religion has a *special* interest for me as a Parsi."

Bombay Gazette, 12th, September, 1903—

"Connected with these changes and the evolution of the cases of nouns are many *interesting* questions, such as when the Vedas were written, the probable date of the ritual of the Vedas or of the legends of the Asuras, of the migration of the Hellenic races, of the rise of the Latin races..."

By the same Author (In English).

1 The Aitareya Upanishad (First of the Series—with Preface, Translation and Notes). Price with postage 0 9

The Right Hon'ble F. Max-Muller, writing on 30th Oct., 1898—

"I hope you will continue your work. There is *much to be done still* in interpreting the Upanishads."

Again on 27th, December, 1898—

"The best thing you can do is to go on with your translation of the Upanishads."

2 The Svetasvatara Upanishad (Second of the Series—with Preface, Translation and Notes). Price with postage ... 0 13

On a paper, entitled 'Samhita of Rig-Veda searched,' and published in the 20th Vol. of the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, His Excellency Lord Northcote—

"A person like myself must read with pleasure such lights as are thrown on the rise of the priestly and decline of the Kshatriya class in the interesting article on the Samhitâ of the Rig-Veda"—H. E.'s speech, Thursday evening, in the Bombay Gazette, March 7, 1902.

On the same paper, the Journal of the Maha-bodhi Society (p. 27, Vol. X, No. 3, July 1901), Calcutta—

"The story of the Rishi Ajigarta, who sold his son for 300 cows, is interesting, we find that human sacrifices were offered in the ancient days, and that its cessation was due to the Khatriyas. The story of the Visvantara Prince related by Mr. Bhagavat is full of humour. Space forbids quoting the whole in the Maha Bodhi.

AN ATTEMPT TO ANALYSE THE MAHÂ-BHÂRATA.

LET us make an attempt to separate the facts from the fiction: the grains of truth, how-so-ever few, from the chaff which envelops them all around many a layer thick in the so-called Mahâ-Bhârata 'long Bhârata'.

Bhârata and Mahâ-Bhârata.

There is one 'long Bhârata' mentioned in the Âśvalâyana* Gṛihya, and immediately before this is mentioned one Bhârata, which seems to have been 'short', though no such word is prefixed to it. Both of these must have been written in Sanskrit, and may be called Ritualistic. Âśvalâyana is however silent as regards the number of verses which each contained, and also as regards the names of their author or authors. The number of verses contained in the Mahâ-Bhârata is said in the Epos itself to be 1,00,000, that is 2,00,000 lines, though the Bhârata is credited only with 24,000 verses, that is 48,000 lines. As the episodes are said to have† contributed to the 'length' of the Mahâ-Bhârata, the Bhârata, the 'short' Bhârata, which contained only 24,000 verses, must have been once held as containing the original story, divested of all the episodes, and therefore earlier. This Bhârata and Mahâ-Bhârata may be called Brahminical, to distinguish them from their Ritualistic sisters. There was thus an earlier work

* Sumantu--Jaimini--Vaiśampâyana--Paila--Sûtra--Bhâshya--Bhârata--Mahâ Bhârata o, 4, III. It is every day in the morning repeated by a Marâṭhâ Brahmin in the so-called Brahma Yajna after the Sandhyâ. The first four are the names of the reputed *First Teachers* of the Atharva, the Sâma, the Yajur, and the Ṛig Veda respectively.

† 'This (contained) one hundred thousand (verses) for persons of meritorious works'. 101. 'He composed the Samhitâ of the Bhârata, containing twenty four thousand (verses)'. 102. '(The volume) minus the episodes is by the wise called the Bhârata'. 103, I, Âdi Parva. The *Bombay Edition* has been used throughout.

called Bhârata; episode after episode came to be added at different places by persons more or less interested, until the body increased so enormously that the weight was raised nearly five times, and the over-grown volume received from the people the appropriate name of Mahâ-Bhârata, 'long' or 'voluminous Bhârata'. The Brahminical Mahâ-Bhârata was thus confessedly a work, not of one hand, of one land, or of one time. This must have been equally true of the Ritualistic Mahâ-Bhârata. But what of the Bhârata, the earlier, the 'short' Brahminical Bhârata of 24,000 verses? Could it, too, have been a work, not of one hand, of one land, or of one time, just like its episode-fed younger sister, the 'long Bhârata'?

Can we learn any thing from the tradition as preserved? Let us see. At times we can learn a good deal from tradition, only we must be willing.

The Sûtidæ, the source.

There was in ancient India a class called Sûta, representing the Homeridæ of heroic Greece. A Sûta, who may be likened to a bard, travelled from village to village and from province to province, reciting to the villagers who assembled in some public place, the stories of the heroes of old times. A Sûta, by name Ugra-śravas and son of Loma-harshaṇa, related the story forming the subject matter of the Mahâ-Bhârata, or rather of the Bhârata, to Śaunaka and other ritualists during their twelve years' sacrificial session in the forest of Nimiśa -Nimisha *for the first time.* The twelve years' session of Śaunaka in the Nimiśa forest has the honour of being mentioned in the Tândya Mahâ Brâhmaṇa* of the Sâma-Veda; it was thus a fact, not a fiction. The situation of this forest, like that of many a place in the Mahâ-Bhârata, there are no materials to ascertain, though it may be loosely premised that the forest was situated some where in the north. Now Śaunaka was a renowned teacher of the Rig-Veda, a composer according† to Pâṇini, also a collector of Vedic hymns, and the compiler of one of the Saṁhitâs. The Mahâ-

* 'The dwellers in the Nimis'a (forest) attained the whole prosperity by this (the twelve years' sacrificial session of Prajâpati)'. 4, 6, XXV.

† 'Śaunakâdibhyaś chhandasi'. 136, 3, IV.

Bhârata story, according to the tradition as preserved by Vedic followers themselves, thus belonged to pre-Śaunaka times, became known *for the first time* to Vedic followers during the S'aunaka times, and was transmitted by them to their descendants of post-S'aunaka times. It was the attempt of post-S'aunaka times, which for the *first* time brought into existence among Vedic followers the Ritualistic Bhârata and Mahâ-Bhârata in which all the persons were made the most faithful followers of Vedic Ritual.

An immortal memorial of the Sûtidæ.

There is one immortal memorial of the Sûtidæ in the verse *Nârâyaṇam namas-kṛitya*, which opens the Mahâ-Bhârata, and the meaning of which is "To Nârâyaṇa having bowed, and also to Nara the best among men, and also to the goddess Sarasvatî, then 'Victory' should be shouted."

But the question arises—'Victory to whom did the Sûtidæ shout'? Possibly, 'victory' to the trio in the verse. But, again, the question—"Whence or who were this trio? Who was the 'goddess Sarasvatî'"? She could not be the Sarasvatî of later Vedic times, the small rivulet lost in sands and situated in South Panjâb; she must be, if at all a river, the Sarasvatî, which is sung* in the Samhitâ as 'flowing from the mountain to the sea', as 'the seventh (sister), resting in (the lap of) the Sindhu (either the river Indus or the sea), the mother', and as 'a rapid and impetuous river'. Who, again, was this Nârâyaṇa, who this Nara? By consulting the grammar† of Pânini one is likely to arrive at the conclusion that Nârâyaṇa was the 'son' immediate or remote 'of Nara', Nara thus being the father, immediate or remote, of Nârâyaṇa, and Sarasvatî possibly the mother. But tradition makes Nara and Nârâyaṇa, brothers; in that case, Sarasvatî was possibly their sister. The trio was thus connected with the profession of the Sûtidæ; but if asked 'How,' no answer can even be attempted, as there is preserved absolutely nothing which can throw even a ray

* 'Flowing from the mountain to the sea'. 2, 95, VII. 'The Sarasvatî, the seventh, the Sindhu (being) the mother'. 6, 36, VII. 'The Sarasvati destroyed with (her) impetuous waves the top of hills'. 2, 61, VI.

† 'Naḍâdibhyah phak'. 99, 1, IV.

of light on such a question. 'Nara and Nârâyaṇa were brothers, Arjuna was the incarnation of the former, and Kṛishṇa of the latter, or Nârâyaṇa was a *ṛishi* who created from his thigh the beautiful Urvaśî and sent her as an acceptable present to Indra'—this is all that one will find in the Purâṇic literature. The Sûtidas, to judge from the verse, were the reciters and tellers, not the readers, of stories. The procedure seems to be that a Sûtides first recited a verse before the assembled people, and then told its meaning; in telling the meaning, he generally expanded or amplified it, hence he had received the epithet of *vyâsa* 'expander, amplifier' also. In course of time, the class of the non-Vedic Sûtidæ or *vyâsidæ* became extinct and its place was taken by the Vedic *vyâsidæ*. What was the language, the quantity etc. of the verses expanded or amplified by the first Sûta before Śaunaka and his brother ritualists, we can never know; the verse *Nârâyaṇam namaskṛitya*, which opens the Brahminical Mahâ-Bhârata of to-day, is in all likelihood the verse which opened the Brahminical Bhârata of 24,000 verses. Possibly, it opened the Ritualistic Bhârata and Mahâ-Bhârata also. As there is no tradition preserved of an attempt having been made to commit to paper or even to memory the things just as they were told by the first non-Vedic Sûtas, this Bhârata of 24,000 verses cannot be taken as the product of the S'aunaka times, or even of the times immediately following the times of S'aunaka; it must have come into existence long long after the times of Śaunaka, when the story had become the common property of the followers of the Vedas in many a land near to and far from Nimiśa, the forest of Śaunaka. Thus the Bhârata 'short', the Brahminical Bhârata of 24,000 verses also, the name of the *last* compiler of which was in all probability Dvaipâyana, must needs be taken, like its episode-fed sister the Bhârata 'long', the Brahminical Mahâ-Bhârata of 1,00,000 verses, as a product not of one land, one hand or one time. The same may be said of the Ritualistic Bhârata, which, with its sister of the Mahâ-Bhârata, may, however, be taken as the product of times not far removed from the times of S'aunaka.

Bhârata and Mahâ-Bhârata, both of post-Śaunaka times.

Can the originally non-Vedic story be unearthed? Can it be

presented in an intelligible form to a reader of the 20th century? Let us make an attempt. An independent reader will be inclined to accept the following abstract as the skeleton of the story presented for the first time to S'aunaka and his companions. The drama may be conveniently divided into three Acts.

The original story.

There was a king by name S'antanu, whose first wife Gangâ after bearing the last son Bhîshma left him for good. The king after her desertion fell in love with Satya-vatî, a fisherman's beautiful daughter, who had previously borne one Parâśara a son named Kṛishṇa, and demanded her of her father. The father consented to the match on the one condition that the son or sons born of the union of his daughter with the king should succeed to the throne in preference to Bhîshma. On Bhîshma waiving his claim to the *gâdî*, the humble daughter of the fisherman became at once queen, and in course of time bore two sons Chitrângada and Vichitra-vîrya to the king. After the death of S'antanu, the former became king; but falling not long after in a bloody battle with a neighbouring prince, he was succeeded by his younger brother, who, though married to two wives, was fond of slave girls, and fell a victim to consumption. He dying childless, Satya-vatî according to the universal custom of the times which was prevalent even among the chosen of Jehovah, asked Kṛishṇa, her son by her first husband, to live with the two childless widows who were sisters, until the birth of a son to each. The two widows were in course of time each blessed with a son; the son of the elder widow was born blind and named Dhṛita-râshṭra, the son of the younger received the name of Paṇḍu. The second widowed queen had an equally fascinating hand-maid, of whom Kṛishṇa had grown fond, and who consequently became the mother by him of a son, named Vidura. Dhṛita-râshṭra was married to a Gandhâra princess; but as he was blind, he could not fight, and so had to be set aside, and the throne given to Paṇḍu, who had married a Kunta princess, whose name was Pṛithâ, and whose son born before her union with Paṇḍu and named Karṇa was reared by Râdhâ, a woman of the Sûta class, who, as already mentioned, represented the Homeridæ in ancient India. The Gândhârî bore one daughter and more than one son to

Dhṛita-râshṭra; but neither the Kunta princess nor her rival, the Madra princess, whose home, if among the *Uttara* Madras, must have been beyond the Himâlayas,* bore Pandu any child. Seeing her union with Pandu fruitless, the Kuntî, who belonged to a tribe or people among whom a childless wife, like a Spartan woman of ancient Greece, could live even during the life time of her husband with or without his consent with another until she became a mother, temporarily united with one man first, then with a second, then with a third, and thus became the mother of three sons, Arjuna being the eldest, and Yudhi-shṭhira the youngest. When pressed by Pandu to unite with a fourth and a fifth, the answer put into the mouth of the Kuntî was, that union† with a fourth would make her a *svairiṇî* 'wanton', union with a fifth a *bandhakî* 'prostitute'. Side by side with this declaration of the Kuntî may be placed the custom of a Mongol woman being permitted to marry three husbands in succession; but after the death of the third, she could not marry‡ a fourth, and so had to retire into a convent and be a nun. The Mâdrî lived only with two men, and from them became the mother of two sons, named Nakula and Saha-deva. There were thus five sons in all born to Pandu. Not long after, Pandu, who, being fond of the chase, was living with his two wives and five sons at some distance from the capital, died, and the Mâdrî either killed herself, or being dearer to him than the other was killed, agreeably to the custom§ discovered by Herodotus among Scythians; after disposing of the two corpses, either by consigning them** to flames, or by raising tombs over them, the foresters conducted the widow with the five princes to the capital,

* 'Beyond the Himavat (are) the provinces of North Kuru and North Madra'. 14, 3, VIII, Aitareya Brâhmaṇa.

† 77, 123, Âdi Parva.

‡ p 46, Vol XII, Indian Antiquary.

§ 'In the remaining space of the grave they (Scythians) bury one of the king's concubines, having strangled her'. 71, IV.

** In the 31st verse, ch 125, Pandu is described as having been cremated in the land where he died, the Mâdrî as his dearer wife burning herself on the funeral pyre. The cremation of the body with the Mâdrî's burning herself on the pyre is again mentioned in the 30th verse, ch 126; but in the 32nd, both the dead bodies are described as being brought for cremation to the capital where they were duly cremated.

ere they were taken care of by the aged Bhîshma, and educated h the sons of Dhṛita-râshṭra. Droṇa taught all the princes the ence of archery and arms. The first Act of the drama may be d to close here.

Now opens the second Act. There could not but be jealousy between the Dhârta-râshṭras 'children of Dhṛita-râshtra' on the one and, and the Pâṇḍavas 'children of Paṇḍu' on the other. To whom did the kingdom belong? to Dur-yodhana, the eldest among the Dhârta-râshṭras, or to Arjuna, the eldest among the Pâṇḍavas? It was a delicate point. By the law of primogeniture which was in force in those days, the kingdom, as a matter of right, belonged to Dhṛita-râshṭra. If he was set aside, he was set aside because he was blind; but how could Dur-yodhana, his eldest son, who was not blind, be set aside or denied the throne when he demanded it? In the veins of Dur-yodhana ran, besides, the blood of Dhṛita-râshṭra, the representative of the dynasty. But was not Paṇḍu the king de facto? and as such, ought not the throne to belong to Arjuna, the eldest among the Pâṇḍavas? But could the royal blood, the blood of Paṇḍu, be said to run in the veins of any of the Pâṇḍavas? Certainly not. All the Pâṇḍavas had this disqualification, which no Dhârta-râshṭra had. The Pâṇḍavas were therefore naturally anxious for matrimonial alliances with the neighbouring tribes or peoples, and the five brothers married the princess of the Pañchâlas, among whom polyandry was prevalent. The custom of several brothers having one common wife, and of two men having conjointly one woman for a wife, is still preserved* in some parts of Cashmere. As the Mâdrî princess is said to have sought two brothers or to have been sought by them, the Madras must have been equally polyandrous with the Pañchâlas. Vedic religion distinctly prohibits† polyandry, though as distinctly it permits polygamy. Bhîma, the second Pâṇḍava, secured the sympathy of the Râkshasa tribes by living with their princess for some time till a son was born. Arjuna also married Subhadrá, sister of Kṛishṇa; this Kṛishṇa must have belonged to

* Native States (a weekly), Madras, 6, April, 1903, 'From the Census Report, Cashmere'.

† 'Therefore one man has many (simultaneous) wives, one woman (has) not many simultaneous husbands.' 23, 2, III, Aitareya Brâhmana.

the Kunta tribe, as the Kuntî princess, mother of the three Pân-
vas, was his aunt, being his father's sister. Arjuna and Krish
signalised their friendship by carrying fire and sword into
Khâṇḍava forest, thus securing the submission of the Asuras, wh
prince was called Maya. The Asuras being celebrated archite
of the time, a hall was caused to be erected by them, in whi
Arjuna took his seat and the Pâṇḍavas rejoiced. Their rejoicing
naturally excited the *jealousy of the* Dhârta-râshṭras, who propose
gambling. The Pâṇḍavas played, but proved unlucky, they wen
on losing heavily; their right to the kingdom was at last staked
and having lost that too, they had no alternative left to then
but to retire into a forest for a period previously fixed. The in
evitable civil war was thus put off for a time. During their stay
in the forest, Jayad-rath, *the son-in-law of* Dhṛita-râshṭra, once
attempted to carry off the Pânchâlî, but was foiled in the attempt
and, besides, carried a captive, though subsequently released and
sent away. Very soon, the Dhârta-râshṭras made a small raid
into the forest against the Pâṇḍavas, who proved by their valour
and tactics more than a match for them. *But the* Pâṇḍavas after
this occurrence displayed greater prudence, and removed themselves
still further in a direction, not known to the Dhârta-râshṭras.
They retired towards a river, the name *Matsya* 'fish' of the pro-
vince showing that it must have been so called on account of it
being bounded or watered by a river. Here, one of the brother
of the queen made a criminal assault on the Pânchâlî and lost hi
life. Not long after, *the Dhârta-râshṭras learned* the news of hov
the queen's brother had met with his death; and having got this
clue, they marched against the capital of the Prince, and carried off a
good many herds of cattle. The forces of Virâṭa, who ruled over the
Matsyas, succeeded in bringing all the herds back, chiefly owing to
the valour of the Pâṇḍavas and generalship of Arjuna. The term
of the residence in a forest having expired, Arjuna with his
brothers was now free, and sent for his son Abhi-manyu to have
his marriage celebrated with Uttarâ, daughter of Virâṭa, thereby
enlisting the Prince and his tribe to fight on his side in the war
which seemed imminent. The second Act here ends.

The Pâṇḍavas now returned openly in broad daylight to the ital, where they were welcomed by their relations and friends. shṇa, Arjuna's brother-in-law, and Vidura, son of the hand-maid he mother of Paṇḍu, both did their best to avert the war, but hout success. War was declared, and arrangements were made have the news brought to the capital for Dhṛita-râshṭra who s blind, as early as possible, and Sanjaya, one of the heralds of e Sûta class was specially appointed for that purpose. The -called Sûtas seem to have acted also as heralds in battle, and eir persons were considered inviolable. The later generations of e Sûtas must have been indebted for the history of the war not ly to Sanjaya the herald, but also to the family and relatives f Râdhâ, who had reared the son of Pṛithâ born before her legal nion with Paṇḍu.

Arjuna, on the eve of the battle, was inclined to peace at any rice, and sought the advice of the *Bhagavat* 'saint, saintly person,' celibate, who possibly was identical with Kapila, founder of the heistic Sânkhya and sung in the S'vetâs'vatara* Upanishad, and o whom the order of preaching and itinerant monks alluded to the Ṛig-Veda† must have owed its existence. The sum and bstance of the Song of the Bhagavat seems to be that war is no ubt an evil, but a necessary evil; that the war which is righte- s is a duty, and that the abandonment of a righteous war is a ral cowardice, a dereliction of duty, in other words a sin, a ught which no sane and moral man ought even for one moment harbour in his mind. Armed with the counsel of the sage, rjuna resolved to fight to the bitter end, trusting in the Voice ithin which unequivocally and unmistakably declared to him the ghteousness of his cause. The aged Bhîshma fell a victim to the hafts of one brother, Droṇa to those of another brother of the Pâñchâlî; Jayad-ratha treacherously slew Abhi-manyu, but Arjuna,

* 'Who (God) fed with every kind of knowledge and watched during delivery that sage Kapila, born before.' 2. V.

† 'Since the *Devas* (stars) like the *Yatis* (monks) nourished the worlds with the light of their discourse).' 7, 72, X. The word *Deva* throughout this hymn is used for 'star'.

the very next day with the help of his co-chariot-warrior and f
ther-in-law Kṛishṇa, avenged the death of his dear and brave s
he also avenged the death of the equally brave son of Bhîma
slaying Karṇa, whom, born before her lawful union with Pan
the Kuntî had made over to the Sûtas for being brought u
Duś-śâsana, brother of Dur-yodhana, met his death at the han
of Bhîma, who, like a Scythian described* by Herodotus, sitti
on the chest of his prostrate enemy, drank the warm blood as
gushed from the fatal wound; the eldest Dur-yodhana also w
brought to the ground by the same mighty arm. The son
Droṇa alone escaped. The war ending, the third, the last Act
the drama closes.

After Arjuna, his grand-son Pari-kshit ascended the thron
The Sarpas and the Takshakas, two nomadic peoples, possibly s
called by the inhabitants of the provinces over-run and devastate
by them, had formed a few settlements in the dominion of Pari
kshit; the settlers rebelled against his authority, and one of them
murdered him. His son Janam-ejaya put down the rebellion b
ordering a general massacre of the settlers in his dominion; bu
the murderer some-how escaped, and Janam-ejaya, at the inte
cession of Âstîka, whose mother was of the Sarpa race, but fat
a non-Sarpa, stopped the massacre. Here the story abruptly en

Ancestors, country, race, and capital of the combatants.

Now as regards the genealogical tree, w
the country and race of the Dhârta-râsht
and the Pâṇḍavas, and the geographical sit
tion of their capital, as found in the Brahminical Mahâ-Bhârata.

There is one genealogy found in the 94th, and another in th
95th chapter of the Âdi-parva, the Opening Book of the volumin
ous epos of the Mahâ-Bhârata. There is very little agreemen
between the two. There are three or four breaks in the firs
genealogy, where a connection between the following and the pre
ceding name can not be satisfactorily established; the second i
evidently a later product, its source also being different. The

* 'When a Scythian overthrows his first enemy, he drinks his blood'
64, IV.

names of Pûru, Bharata, and Kuru are found in both; the names of the father, the grand father, the great grand father, the father of the great grand father, the son, and the grand son of Bharata, and of the father of Kuru are identical in both; all the other names are different, one or two that are identical have their places changed.

S'antanu has been, notwithstanding the glaring discrepancies, made a descendant of Kuru, of Bharata, and of Pûru. Both the genealogies agree that the king S'antanu had running in his veins the blood of Kuru, of Bharata, and of Pûru. S'antanu is said to have been the younger brother of Devâpi. This has been done to establish a connection between this S'antanu and the S'antanu of Yâska, who in his Nirukta makes both of them descendants of Kuru, though the hymn referred to makes Devâpi,* the *purohita* of S'antanu, a son or descendant of Rishṭi-sheṇa, S'antanu himself being a son or descendant of Ulâna. The story as preserved in the Nirukta has more than a passing interest in that in those early times of Vedic ritual, the rank of a king was higher than that of his priest; a warrior could in those ages become a priest, only in doing so he degraded himself. The Purâṇic literature, which originated and multiplied in an age in which the priest managed to set himself above the king and to set aside the claim of the warrior class to the office of priest, could of course not help perverting the story by making Devâpi a heretic† of the first water. Our S'antanu then could not be the S'antanu of the hymn; he might be the S'antanu of the Nirukta, and in that case a lineal descendant of Kuru, and as such the ruler of Kuru-jangala 'the jungle of Kuru,' also called Kuru-kshetra 'the field of Kuru,' or rather 'the kingdom of Kuru'.

Were Kuru, Bharata and Pûru names of particular kings, in other words of the founders of dynasties, or of tribes? They may be taken in either way; but one dynasty could not have supplant-

* 98, X. The Nirukta story is given by Sâyaṇa just in the beginning of the Bhâshya on the hymn For Devâpi being an Ârshṭisheṇa see the verse 5, and for Śantanu being an Aulâna the verse 11 of the same hymn.

† 7-9, 20, IV, Vishṇu Purâṇa, Bombay Edition.

ed another, or one tribe occupied the province of another, except by a revolution, at least in those ages of constant and unceasing warfare. If these be taken as originally the names of tribes or races, the singulars were nothing else but individualisations of tribal or racial names, as were Ion and Dorus, Romanus-Romulus; and as such, Sam-varaṇa, Dushyanta, and Yayâti, the names respectively of their fathers a fiction, a myth. If they be taken as the names of the founders of the several dynasties, the names of their fathers could not be a fiction, a myth; but those fathers being the lineal representatives of the dynasty immediately preceding, or their sons having peaceably and without blood-shed taken possession of the throne, must be pronounced a fiction, a myth. It would possibly be better to take the three names as those of the founders of the three dynasties. The association of Kuru, a pre-Vedic prince, with a Vedic *purohita* must be the work of some one of post-S'aunaka times, when the story had become the common property of all Vedic followers. The Brahminical Mahâ-Bhârata must have received it from the Ritualistic. One might, besides, be inclined to take the word Kuru in the story to mean the founder of the Kuru dynasty, when he remembers that the same word with s added to it, as it is added to Manu in Vedic Sanskrit, and made *Kurus*, the westernised Cyrus, in the earlier, and *Khusru* in the later language of the trans-Indus Âryas, does mean the founder of a dynasty in the pre-Hystaspidae history of Persia, and in the work of Xenophon. But one might not be inclined to take the word Kuru in Kuru Jangala—Kuru Kshetra —Kuru Sthalî, which more or less mean the "land of Kuru", to mean the founder of the dynasty. In the expression the "land of Kuru", the word Kuru must have meant "the Kurus", that is "the Kuru tribe". Though there might be some difficulties in taking S'antanu as a scion of the Kuru dynasty, or as a member of the Kuru tribe, he may without much difficulty be taken as the ruler of "the land of the Kurus".

But where was the original land of the Kurus situated? A post-S'aunaka Ritualist would, no doubt, following the Tândya and other Brâhmaṇas, call the span of the land, which is watered

by the Saras-vatî lost in sand, the ground hallowed by the gods or Prajâpati having* performed their or his sacrifice there, the cradle of the Kuru race or tribe. But the story belongs to times long long before the times of S'aunaka, when the Saras-vatî was known as "a rapid and impetuous river, with seven tributaries", so graphically described in the hymns. The Sârasvatî of the hymns must therefore have been a mighty river, and so the two likely claimants to that name are the Oxus and the Indus, the Tigris and the Euphrates being rather far from the scene. The province of Uttara Kuru thus lay to the north, and Dakshina Kuru to the south of either the Oxus or the Indus. The scene of the drama of the Three Acts must therefore be transferred more or less to the north of the region popularly assigned to it.

As the name of the epos is derived from Bharata, and as seven chapters (68–74) with very little connection either with the preceding or following chapters have been devoted in the Âdi Parva to the story of Dushyanta, his father, and S'akuntalâ, his mother, the attempt to make S'antanu a Bhârata was either the latest among the three, or, if not the latest, it had somehow become more popular than the other two, which make him a Kaurava and a Paurava, with the Sûtidae or the Vyâsidae. It may be that as the majority of Vedic followers called themselves Bhârata, it was but natural on their part to make S'antanu and his children belong to the same tribe or race to which they themselves belonged. The sub-episode of Vis'vâmitra and Menakâ must of course be placed at the doors of the Vyâsidae of mediaeval ages, whose ears could not but ache at hearing of the great warrior Dushyanta marrying, or rather seducing S'akuntalâ, daughter of Kanva a priest.

The attempt to make S'antanu a descendant of Pûru was possibly the earliest, to be ascribed rather to the Sûtidae than the Vyâsidae, though the hand of the latter, of course, the latest, may be unmistakably detected in the curse of Kacha being sung as

* So much indeed is the *vedi* of Prajâpati, as much is the Kuru Kshetra'. 8. 18. XXV. The Bhâshya-kâra calls the same *Deva-Yajana*. For the Sarasvati as understood by post-S'aunakists, the reader may be referred to the three preceding *Khandas* (10-12) of the same Chapter.

the cause of the marriage between the daughter of the high priest of the Asuras and a prince of the Nahusha tribe, which now and then, like her sisters, prominently figures in the Sam*hitâ of the Rig-veda. The fact seems to be that Yayâti of the Nahusha tribe married Deva-yânî, daughter of the high priest, and also S'armishṭhâ, daughter of the king of the Asuras, that the former made the atmosphere often hot for Yayâti on account of his partiality for the latter, and that Yayâti, setting at naught the law of primogeniture, made the youngest son of S'armishṭhâ the heir to his throne. The rest of the episode of Yayâti, together with the absurd episode of Nahusha, is a myth pure and simple of the latest Vyâsidae. The Pûru tribe is said to have occupied both the banks† of the river Saras-vatî, that is the banks either of the Indus or the Oxus. Since Yayâti formed two matrimonial connections with the Asuras, one with their high priest, and another with their king, the territories of the two must have been conterminous; the story evidently belongs to a period when the empire of the Asuras, westernised as Assyrians, had reached the river Saras-vatî. It may be that the Pûrus, the Bharatas, and the Kurus, were three different tribes, three different sister-tribes, living near one another, though without any of them tracing its origin to the other. Our S'antanu possibly belonged to one of them; possibly to none of them.

The capital is indiscriminately called Hâstina pura–Hastinâ pura Vâraṇa pura, and Gaja pura, meaning the "Elephant-city". An attempt has been made to prove that the older or real name was the first, and that it was so called because it was founded by Hasti, son of Suhotra (95 ch, Âdi-parva); but the preceding chapter (94) passes at once from Suhotra to Aja-mîḍha, making no room for Hasti, one of the intermediates. If it can be proved that the real

---

* '(O) holder of the *vajra* (a weapon), by which (thou) didst make the inimical Dâsas, Âryas, and *Nahushas* easy to conquer' 10, 22, VI. 'Sprung from the Manush and *Nahush*, 6, 80, X. 'He (Agni) having besieged the *Nahushas* made them pay tribute'. 5, 6, VII. "The impetuous Saras-vatî yielded milk to the Nahusha (tribe)." 2, 95, VII.

† 'Thy (two) lovely food-growing (banks) the Pûrus possess'. 2, 96, VII.

name was Gaja pura, the honour of having been the capital of S'antanu may have to be given to the city of Ghazni, which was made known for the first time on this side by Mahmûd, the first Moslem conqueror of India, and which was called Gajinî by the natives of Cashmere. Gajinî purî would be the feminine, Gaja pura the neuter form of the word. It is next to impossible to determine with accuracy the position not only of the capital of S'antanu, but of a good many cities, rivers, and mountains, on account of the Purâṇas and kindred works teeming with wild assertions, patent contradictions, and most absurd derivations, with fanciful and often puerile plays on their names.

Song of the Bhagavat.

When Arjuna is taken as having been the eldest among the Pândavas, a point which will be touched further on, there is no necessity for considering the Song of the Bhagavat as forming no part of the original story related by the Sûta to Śaunaka. The Song of the Bhagavat must have been received, at least in spirit, if not in letters, by the Vedic followers with S'aunaka at their head; but as its teachings were opposed to their own, no wonder if they as a body neglected it. However, it could not but have made a division in the Vedic camp, few must have welcomed it and seceded from the Ritual, the extent and nature of which during the S'aunaka times we have no means of ascertaining even approximately, the present Vedic ritual, with its tediously minute details and obscenities of the sacrifice in general and the horse sacrifice and kindred rites in particular, being for the most part a product of post-S'aunaka times. There is, however, an allusion in the 10th Maṇḍala to the preaching *Yatis* "monks", who by the light of their teachings dispelled the gloom prevailing in the heart of their hearers. The anti-Ritual stream, though slender, thus ran parallel to the mighty Amazon of the ...ual. The post-S'aunaka age of the tedious and obscene ritual ...urally created a disgust for it among many a Vedic follower, ...nd the consequence was a rage for renunciation of the world with its ritual. This burning desire to renounce the ritual with the world brought into existence the class of the so-called *tyâgins* "renouncers of the world", who were in plain language so many "beggars and

idlers". Those who renounced the world on account, as they alleged, of the misery so palpable in it, continued in it even after they had ostensibly renounced it; they ate, they drank, just as those who had not renounced it did, and were as subject to bodily ailments as the others, only they lived at the expense of others, often sumptuously. In an age in which this class had enormously increased and become an intolerable nuisance, an anonymous poet versified for the *first* time the doctrines of the Bhagavat; hence the anti-Veda and anti-beggar or anti-renouncer tone of the author, who was evidently a follower of the theistic Sânkhya, and as such could not even dream of renouncing the world. The earlier Upanishads, such as the Aitareya and the S'vetâs'vatara, which drew their inspiration more or less from the theistic Sânkhya identical with the teachings of the Bhagavat, are good specimens of the literature of that class. The latest Upanishads, such as the Brihad Âraṇyaka, which is an awfully long and a tedious reading, have no doubt redeeming passages yielding to none in sublimity. But curiously enough, the theistic and optimistic Brahmin in them will be found gladly meeting and warmly welcoming the atheistic and pessimistic Budhist in the field of the renunciation of the world; from this field both jointly set out on an expedition to the Tree of Knowledge, which ends in the case of both in an ardent and unquenchable desire for the emancipation of their souls from future births or transmigrations. The monotheistic teachings of the Bhagavat and his devoted followers had, however, already invaded the Near West, where they found a better, a more congenial soil, and so had taken firm and deep roots. The Bhagavat, the Jehovistic, with the Christian and the Moslem, its two daughters, and the Zoroastrian tradition being identical in spirit, though now and then differing in letters, must have had a common origin. The devotional stream with its earlier canal of the Prophets Saints theory could, for the *first* time in the history of the wo deluge in the 6th century B. C. the Near West, its progress ther being arrested by polytheistic Greeks in the battle of Marathon But six centuries later, the new canal in the form of the part or the whole incarnation theory spread in the Near West, whence it went on encroaching, though gradually and therefore unobserved,

on the Far West, having soon thoroughly orientalised it by sending the Grecian polytheism to return no more down down into the realms of Pluto, the new canal, which now revealed the mighty and irresistible force of a stormy ocean, went on spreading with a rapidity and violence knowing no check on the Further West, till in the 4th Christian century it dealt a similar blow to the polytheism and materialism of both the Old and the New Rome. Two centuries later, the Prophet of Mecca re-opened the earlier canal that seemed choked up, and the flood burst out with such violence and vehemence, that in a very short time it could submerge not only the Near and the Far, but the Further, and even the Furthest West bounded on the North by the Mediterranean Sea, whence it could again turn also northward and successfully inundate the Iberian Peninsula.

But here in the East, the monotheistic traditions of the Bhagavat had to contend not only with the earlier polytheism of the Vedas and the later pantheism of the Vedântas, but also with the atheism of Budhists. Monotheism as a matter of necessity is uncompromisingly inclusive, it knows no class or caste and custom, all traditions to the contrary being later accretions or excrescences; it has a sternness and stiffness which neither polytheism nor pantheism nor atheism can *in reality* have. The Brahmins, who, as Vaishṇavas, later on identified the Bhagavat with their Vishṇu, could not but become uncompromisingly inclusive, haters of class and caste distinctions, and non-observers or breakers of family customs and kindred superstitions. Idolatry crept in among them only when Kṛishṇa was made the whole incarnation of Vishṇu.

Now the question arises—"Who was this Kṛishṇa, who was made the whole incarnation of Vishṇu? Could he be Kṛishṇa, the *Sârathi* "co-chariot-warrior" and brother-in-law of Arjuna? Let us try to solve the question, without bringing into the field the Kṛishṇa of the Samhitâ, who in the eyes of the seers must have been a notorious* heretic, or the Kṛishṇa, whom

* 13-15, VIII. 'Kṛishṇa' in these verses seems to mean 'black', either 'by colour' or 'in heart', the real name of the heretic, who occupied the river Anśumati with 10,000 troops, being Drapsa.

with his brother* Mâra, Buddha is said to have completely humbled.

The first Kṛishṇa.

One Kṛishṇa was the son of Satyavatî; he was the real father of Dhṛitarâshṭra, Paṇḍu and Vidura, though afterwards made identical with Dvaipâyana, compiler of the Brahminical epos of the Bhârata of 24000 verses, and therefore known as Kṛishṇa--Dvaipâyana now-a-days. A second Kṛishṇa appears for the first time on the scene in the story of the Pâṇḍavas; Subhadrâ, the sister of this Kṛishṇa, who belonged to the tribe of the Kuntas, was carried off and taken to wife by Arjuna. Next this Kṛishṇa in the company of Arjuna sets fire to the Khâṇḍava Forest, and sees that the whole is reduced to ashes; next he is seen advocating the cause of the Pâṇḍavas, though without success, before the Dhârtarâshṭras; and in the war he chooses to be the companion or comrade of Arjuna. Kṛishṇa the son of Satyavatî, and Kṛishṇa the comrade of Arjuna—these two may be called the Northern Kṛishṇas.

The second Kṛishṇa.

The third Kṛishṇa.

There seems to have been a third Kṛishṇa of the Sûra tribe, whose capital was Mathurâ on the Jumnâ. His father's name was Vasudeva, his mother's Devakî. Kansa, brother of Devakî, had married two daughters of Jarâ-sandha, the powerful King of Magadha, the modern Bihâr; and on the strength of this connection with Jarâ-sandha, he had dethroned Vasudeva, and throwing him with his wife, that is, Devakî his own sister, into prison, usurped the kingdom. Kṛishṇa, the son of Vasudeva and Devakî, was, therefore, brought up among cow-herds, as Romulus the Roman and Cyrus the Persian were brought up among shepherds. In course of time, Kṛishṇa, like Romulus, came to know his rank, and then made short work of his maternal, as Romulus did of his paternal, uncle. But Jarâ-sandha having made Mathurâ rather hot for him, Kṛishṇa prudently retired westward, where he is said to have founded Dvârakâ on the sea-coast. More of him we do not know. This Kṛishṇa may be called the Central Kṛishṇa.

* Pages 376-380, Lalita Vistara, Calcutta Edition.

The fourth Kṛishṇa.

There was yet another Kṛishṇa, who may be called the Southern; this Kṛishṇa was born in a nomadic race, called Gopa, whose wealth consisted of herds of cattle, as the wealth of shepherds consists of sheep, and the wealth of Tartar tribes consists of horses. These nomads had a chief called Nanda, whose wife was Yas'odâ. A son was born to them; his name was *Kanhara*, which may be detected in Kannaḍa, the older name of the Carnatic, and from which is derived the modern Canara -Canarese. The river also, which watered the country, was after him called Kanhara, which name has been Sanskritised into Kṛishnâ; in the inscriptions of the Deva-girî Yâdavas, the names Kanhara and Kṛishṇa will be found made identical. Nanda had another wife, who bore him Bala, who was exceedingly fond of palm juice. Now the palm tree does not grow on the banks of the Jumnâ, it grows nowhere in North India; so the Gopas, who had palm groves and whose children had a partiality for the exhilarating juice of palms, must have occupied and owned a more or less extensive tract in the south, not in the north of India. Both the brothers had, like Samson, superhuman strength, which they successfully used against all who did not belong to their race, and who, therefore, came in their way while they were grazing their cattle from one forest to another. Soon after, the two brothers established a station called Dvâravatî, which became their head quarters and from which the Gopas could spread northward and southward. The so-called Dhursamudra, capital of the Bellal Kings, captured by the Moslems under Kâfur in the 13th Christian century, stood on the site of the Dvârakâ of the Gopas. They had another station further south; as it was situated in the Madhu Forest, it received the name of Madhurâ, which it still bears. They did not take much time to spread to the river Nerbuddâ, threatening S'iśu-pâla of Chedi on the one side, and Bhîshmaka of Kuṇḍina in Berar on the other. Rukmiṇî, the beautiful princess of Kuṇḍina, was betrothed to S'is'u-pâla; but Kṛishṇa carried her off and took her to wife. S'is'upâla was soon overwhelmed and crushed by the Gopas. The story ends here abruptly.

The volume, in which the exploits of Kṛishṇa and Bala are re-

corded, is named Hari-vans'a, and is said to form part and parcel of the Mahâ-Bhârata. The very name Hari-vans'a is a nut hard to crack. Why should the Gopas, the Sûras, and the Kuntîs, be held to form the "dynasty" or the "tribe of Hari?" There was, no doubt, a Vedic tribe of the name of *Hari*, just as there were tribes bearing the name of Anu, Pûru, and Druhyu, the monkeys in the Râmâyaṇa also have received the name of *Hari*; but it is most strange that there should be no individualisation, if we except *Hari*, one of the Vedic names of Indra, in the whole Purâṇic literature of this tribal name, as there is of other tribal names, such as Anu, Pûru, Druhyu, and Kuru. Not only is there no individualisation of the tribal name *Hari*, but the name is never made to denote a descendant, or used in Purâṇic literature in the plural, though other names, such as Pûru, Kuru and Madhu, are individualised, and also made to denote a descendant, or used in the plural for the whole tribe. How and when did the name *Hari* come to be applied to Vishṇu?

The Southern Kanhara being a Gopa was not within the pale of Vedic civilization. He was remembered as a hero and was worshipped, his cult had come into existence and had spread among the Gopas; his brother Bala also was deified with him, and made his companion in all his sports and exploits. This Kanhara, the Sanskritised Kṛishṇa, came, in course of time, to be confounded with the Central Kṛishṇa, and thereby brought within the pale of Vedic civilization. But endosmosis and exosmosis, or (in common language) "give and take", is one of the immutable laws of Nature. The Brahminical civilization made the Gopa, a genuine Kshatriya; but the Gopas gradually placed their Kanhara, now metamorphosed into Kṛishṇa, above Indra, who stands at the head of Vedic divinities, in the story of Mount* Go-vardhana. Madhurâ and Dvâra-vatî could easily be identified, or rather confounded with Mathurâ and Dvârakâ, and palms be made to spring up and multiply even on the Jumnâ by the heated imagination of a poet. Next followed the identification

The popular Kṛishṇa a 'triple' hero.

* Chs 74-76, Vishṇu Parva, Hari-vansa, Calcutta Edition.

of the 'double' Kṛishṇa with the Northern Kṛishṇa of the Kuntîs. The Kṛishṇa of the people and the Purâṇas is thus a 'triple' hero, formed by a combination of the three Kṛishṇas, distinct in origin and separated by centuries from one another. The Kṛishṇa-worship being in origin a hero-worship was as a matter of necessity an idol-worship. The Sûtidae could have known only the Kṛishṇa of the Kunti tribe, neither the one of the Sûra tribe, nor the other of the Gopa race.

Incarnation theory in origin Christian.

When was this 'triple' Kṛishṇa made the whole incarnation of Vishṇu? When and how did he come to be made a Yâdava? The only answer that can be attempted to the second question is, that he was *somehow* made a Yâdava prior to his being made the whole incarnation of Vishṇu. Not only the whole-incarnation, but also the part-incarnation theory, especially as developed and perfected in the Purâṇas, bears on it the unmistakable stamp of Christianity. So, the identification of the Bhagavat with the Supreme Spirit may be placed somewhere in the 1st, that with Vishṇu 'Vedic Ritual' in the earlier, and that of Kṛishṇa with Vishṇu 'Vedic Ritual" in the latter half of the 2nd century of Christ.

The trans-Indus mould in the Mahâ-Bhârata.

The opening and closing of the Mahâ-Bhârata as presented to-day are cast in the mould rather of the trans-Indus Âryas than in that of their cis-Indus brethren. To the cis-Indus Ârya, the dog is an unclean animal, whose very touch is polluting; the trans-Indus Ârya on the other hand holds it as a clean animal, whose touch being considered spiritually beneficial is on occasions specially solicited. When a dog has two circular marks above the two eyes, a trans-Indus Ârya calls it *chathra chasma*, and a cis-Indus *chatur aksha**, both words meaning 'four-eyed'. A 'four-eyed' dog is held in greater veneration by a trans-Indus Ârya; but to a Vedic Ârya, whose blood the Brahmin of to-day specially claims to be running in his veins, a 'four-eyed' dog

* 2, 4, 8, III, Taittiriya Brâhmaṇa. All the 10 Khaṇḍas in the 4th Anuvâka are interesting.

was such a great abomination, that it was nothing less than sin incarnate, and so, one had to be specially brought and beaten to death in the horse-sacrifice, and the dead body with legs stretched out was placed at the bottom of a stream, the horse to be sacrificed being made to rest his four feet on the four feet of the dead dog under water. The dog guiding the Pâṇḍavas to heaven in the Closing Book is a piece which could thus have come out of the head only of a trans-Indus, never of a cis-Indus Ârya of to-day or his remote Vedic ancestor. The curse of the bitch of the Devas is held just in the opening of the Mahâ-Bhârata to have been the main cause of the interruption and abrupt conclusion of the Sarpa-satra of Janam-ejaya; this, again, is a fiction of which a trans-Indus Ârya might leisurely dream, but a cis-Indus Ârya never. The trans-Indus Âryas were familiar with the name Kuru—Kurus and its modifications Kusru-Khusru; they had among them also names ending in *aspa-aśpa*, the Sanskrit *aśva* 'horse', such as Viśtâśpa, in *Yâtes*, such as Alyâtes, in *mainyu*, the Sanskrit *manyu*, such as Vohu-mainyu, the Sanskrit Bhumanyu being apparently its modification. The name *Darius* is apparently either the Sanskrit *Druhyu* or *Turvasu*. The name *Dushyanta*, difficult of derivation, is probably a corruption of Duśmanta, a word of the trans-Indus Âryas. According to the Father of History, the Medes* in earlier times were called Âryas. The Persians owed their religion with many of their customs to the Medic nation; the Magu, the Magi of Greek and Maga of Sanskrit writers, who officiated as priests among Persians, formed a recognised class or tribe† of the Medes. The word *Mobed* denoting a 'priest' to-day among Pârsîs, the lineal descendants of Persians, is derived from *Magu pat-Magu pati*. The Medes may thus be called the earlier, the Persians, the later trans-Indus Âryas. The Bhârata of Dvaipâyana was the Brahminical version, that is, the version among the cis-Indu Âryas, of the story of the war between the Dhârta-râshṭras and the Pâṇḍavas, both tracing their descent

---

* 'They (Medes) were formerly called Arians by all nations'. 62, VII.

† 'The following are the tribes of the Medes, ...the Magi'. 101, I. For the Magi being the priests of Persians, see 132, I; for the importance etc. of the dog, see 140, I.

from Kuru the king, or Kuru the tribe. Could there have also been a version of the war among the earlier or the later trans-Indus Âryas? A suspicion is roused of there having been such a version by the incident which opens, and also by the incident, which closes the Mahâ-Bhârata. There is also the tradition* of the worlds of the gods, the Gandharvas, and the Pitars, the reputed demi-gods, being each furnished with a more or less voluminous copy of the Mahâ-Bhârata.

The Grecian mould.

The birth of the Pâṇḍavs has been cast rather in the Grecian mould. The stories of Indra, Vâyu, and Yama having performed *nikâ* marriages with the Kuntî, and of the two A'svins with the Mâdrî, bear the Hellenic stamp. Since the stories of Vedic divinities having formed liaisons with mortal princesses and damsels are so few, there is no necessity for supposing an independent cis-Indus mould. These liaisons of the Kuntî and the Mâdrî with the Vedic divinities can not be carried higher than the 3rd century B. C., the century, which followed the reduction of Porus by the Macedonian Alexander, and which for the first time witnessed the spread of the amours and legends of Zeus and other Hellenic gods on this side of the Indus.

'Yavana' derived.

The word *Yavana*, however, which is originally the racial or tribal name *Ion-Ionian* Persianised, though subsequently applied indiscriminately by the trans-Indus Âryas to all Greek races and tribes, may have to be carried two centuries higher to the reign of Darius Hystaspes, who with his descendants exacted tribute every year from the province of Panjab. The story of Purochana, who erected a house of combustibles of all sorts in which the Pâṇḍavas were lodged, and which was set fire to with the intention of reducing it with the Pâṇḍavas to ashes, and that of the destructive raid of Kâla Yavana, who most probably was one of the Shahi kings of Kathia-

* 'Thirty lacs in the world of the gods; fifteen lacs among the Pitars, and fourteen among the Gandharvas.' 105 'One lac among men.' 106, Âdi Parva. Nârada is said to have recited it to the gods, Asita Devala to the Pitars, and Śuka to the Gandharvas, the Yakshas and the Râkshasas, and Vaiśampâyana to men. The 60 lacs were thus distributed.

vad, though described as ultimately reduced to ashes by the flame darting forth from the eye of Muchukunda, awakened by Krishna from his long sleep of thousands of years in a cave somewhere on the river Nerbuddâ, have thus the highest limit assigned to their antiquity.

When Yudhi-shthira made the eldest.

In one of the later ages when Yama, who in the Vedas is the 'Lord of the manes', came to be identified with Dharma, which word again having lost the earlier meaning of 'Vedic ritual' had come to be rather loosely used, the common people thereby understanding 'holiness, righteousness, purity' in general, Arjuna the eldest, begotten by Indra the highest Vedic divinity, was made the youngest son of the Kuntî, his place being given to Yudhi-shthira, who thus became the eldest. The story of Yudhi-shthira the son of Dharma being the eldest, and Arjuna the son of Indra being the youngest son of the Kuntî, was no doubt known to Budhists as mention is made of it in one of the prose passages of Lalita-vistara, the traditional life of Bud-dha, a translation of which was made in Tibetan in the first Christian century; but this alteration or emendation can not be placed in the first Christian century or in a century B. C., because the Tibetan translation which could have proved its antiquity is said to be among the lost treasures of the world, and the present Lalita-vistara, to judge from the number of the alphabets* enumerated in a prose passage containing the alphabets of Huns and others said to have been learnt by Bud-dha, must be pronounced a composition of the fourth or fifth Christian century. The body of the work, especially the metrical portion, as Râjendra Lal holds, is undoubtedly older; but the older work having fallen into the hands of the later Budhists of various provinces, successive additions came to be made, especially to the prose passages in it, by them.

* Among the 64 alphabets enummerated are those of the Dards and Huns, which latter name a writer of the 3rd or 4th Christian century *alone* could know; p. 143, Calcutta Edition. The reader may be referred to the preface of Rajendra Lal Mitra to the work. The reference to the five Pândavas will be found on page 24 of the work.

Fiction of the bringing down of Vedic divinities.

That the Kuntî could, by virtue of the *mantras* which formed the gift of a Brahmin priest, bring down from their respective heavens even the Vedic divinities, is a fiction of one of the latest ages, when the Brahmin priest had contracted the habit of exalting his real or reputed ancestors by inventing and circulating stories of the various powers they possessed and the many miracles they performed. To the same ages may be assigned the supposition of the efficacy of curses, for which and for many a kindred superstition the Brahmins or *Mâhaṇas* were evidently indebted to the S'ramaṇas or *Samaṇas*, the well-known priests of the nomadic tribes of trans-Himalayan regions whose curses inspired an indescribable* terror and whose sorcery a singular awe in the minds of the otherwise intrepid Mongols of the great Zenghis and his ancestors.

Traces of Samanism.

The earlier bards, both Brahmins and Kshatriyas.

It should not, however, be supposed that the Brahmin bard was master of the situation in early ages also, when he had a rival, a formidable one, in the Kshatriya bard; when the Brahmin bard of later post-S'aunaka times raised Paras'u-râma, Vasishṭha, and others of his class to the skies by making them invincible even to the gods, the Kshatriya bard brought them all down again to the earth by making them quake and beat a retreat before Bhîshma, Vis'vâ-mitra, and other worthíes of his class. The post-S'aunaka times may thus have to be divided into the earlier and the later, the rivalry between the two higher classes being a characteristic of the latter, not of the former, to which may safely be assigned the Ritualistic Bhârata and Mahâ-Bhârata. But the *vyâsa*, who originally was a reciter, became after the age of Dvaipâyana a reader; and though the edition of Dvaipâyana must have recorded the achievements of both the Brahmin and the Kshatriya *vyâsa*, in course of time the Brahmin who solely occupied himself with letters, outstripped in the race his Kshatriya brother who thought letters to be no concern of his, and, having become master

* Pages 75-86, Vol. XII, Indian Antiquary.

of the situation, went on making additions in the form of new and new stories with the special object of lowering the Kshatriya classes in the eyes and estimation of his brother priests.

Opening sub-Parvas of Âdi Parva.

The simple story of Jarat-Kâru, father of Âstîka who stopped the massacre of the Sarpas, had additions made to it by a Brahmin who bitterly hated either the world-renouncing Budhist monks or the Sannyâsins; the object of the author of the sub-*parva* Puloma in exalting the Brahmin, and yet at the same time in recommending to him for adoption the doctrine of the *a-hinsâ* "non-destruction (of animal life)" as propounded by a Budhist, not as propounded by a Vedic follower, is transparent enough. The sub-*parva* Paushya partakes more of the nature of the Upanishad Age, especially in the vivid picture drawn of how the *guru* taught and how the pupil learned, which picture the reader will find as vividly drawn in the Chhândogya Upanishad; the atmosphere of this sub-*parva* is undoubtedly Vedic, though there is in places a sprinkling of the Purânic idea of Vedic divinities assuming at times the forms of lower animals.

Vyâsa, a fictitious person.

The story told by a Sûtides had become in earlier times the common property and heir-loom only of the Rig-Vedins, because S'aunaka himself belonged to the Rig-Veda, and so did all his companions who had the honour to sit with him in the sacrificial session of 12 years. As the earlier Sûtidae became extinct, their place, as already alluded to, was taken by the *vyâsas*, who belonged either to the Brahmin or the Kshatriya classes. The Vyâsas multiplied among the Vedic followers, and formed the Vyâsidae who, following the custom of the times, individualised the name of their profession, just as the Homeridae did, and brought into existence Vyâsa, a fictitious person like Homer and others of the class also on the other side of the Indus, especially in Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. Now there was an age, the distinguishing characteristic of which was a complete ignorance of the language of the ritual taught by the Vedas. This age may be placed in the 1st or 2nd Christian century, but not earlier. In this age there lived a Vyâsa who seems

to have been a follower of the Yajur-Veda, but was innocent of the first principle of the Ritual of the Brahminical sacrifice, that no non-Brahmin,* no non-priest, not even a king, could perform a *Sattra*; he did not, besides, know that compounds such as Âdityânâm ayana, Angirasâm ayana, and Sarpâṇâm ayana† or Sarpa Sattra meant "the way" or "form of (the sacrificial session held by) the Âdityas, the Angiras, and the Sarpas" respectively, all the three being originally the names of the tribes who had left their foot-prints on Vedic ritual. So our Vyâsa could not help confounding the Vedic Sarpâṇam-ayana or Sarpa-Sattra with the massacre of the Sarpas ordered by Janam-ejaya, and misunderstanding the word Sarpa the earlier meaning of which had been completely forgotten, spun and wove out of his imagination a sacrificial session in which the king Janam-ejaya was honoured with the place of S'aunaka, and Vais'ampâyana, the first teacher of his, that is, the Yajur-Veda, with that of the Sûta. The sacrificial session of S'aunaka, the most celebrated among the teachers of the Rig-Veda, and his Brahmin associates who held seats in it for 12 years, with the Sûta relating to them the stories he knew, was a fact; the Sarpa-Sattra described in the Tâṇḍya Mahâ-Brâhmaṇa also was a fact; but the Mahâ-Bhârata Sarpa-Sattra, the exact duration of which is not stated, in which the serpent species of the reptile genus is described as forming the oblations thrown into fire, the Kshatriya king in which is made the *sole* sacrificer, there being no associate, and in which the place of the non-Brahmin Sûta is occupied by Vais'ampâyana said to be the first teacher of the Yajur-Veda, must be pronounced a fiction pure and simple of the Yajur-Vedins who proceeded more or less on the lines of the Rig-Vedins, and made this singular and unprecedented *sattra* see the light. The Rig-Vedins, a few years after this memorable event, twisted the epithet

The Râkshasa Sattra, another fiction.

* The reader may be referred to the 10th Kaṇḍikâ of the XII Chapter of the Âśvalâyana Śrauta Sûtra. The performers of a Sattra must have the so-called *pravaras*, which no Kshatriya or Vaiśya has.

† See for the first the 1st, for the 2nd the 2nd, and for the third the 15th Khaṇḍa of the XXV Chapter of the Tâṇḍya Mahâ-Brâhmaṇa.

*parâśara** 'great destroyer (of the Yâtus and Râkshasas)' applied to Indra, and succeeded in reproducing a copy of the Sarpa-sattra in the Râkshasa-sattra† which they ascribed to a member, who was the first husband of Satya-vatî queen of S'antanu, of the Parâśara family an offshoot of the S'aktis, who were again an offshoot of the Vasishṭhas; but the copy is poor, very poor indeed, so that there is no one representing Vaiśampâyana, who is said to have commenced reading and *expanding* the Mahâ-Bhârata at the conclusion of the Sarpa-sattra to Janam-ejaya, though there is one corresponding to Âstîka in Pulastya, whose children all the Râkshasas are supposed to have been.

The Râja-sûya in the Hall-Book, the Second Book, betrays on the part of the writer an equally lamentable and unpardonable ignorance of the form of that sacrifice as found in the Ritualistic literature. The *argha-haraṇa* or *arghya-pûjâ* 'bringing of the meat offering' or 'honouring one who deserves a meat offering', corrupted subsequently into *agra-pûjâ* 'the honour of worshipping first (in a large gathering)', which had to be performed when there was even an ordinary friend as a guest in the house‡, must have been an every day occurrence, a common thing; there is nothing, corresponding to the lengthy *argha-haraṇa* or *arghya-pûjâ* found in the Second Book of the Mahâ-Bhârata, in the Râja-sûya ritual as unfolded in the Sacrificial Manuals‖. The Sacrificial Manuals lay down the ceremony of the reciting or reading of the S'unas'-s'epa legend, as described at some length in the Aitareya§ Brâhmaṇa, by the

The Argha-haraṇa also, a fiction.

---

* 'Indra became the Parâśara of the Yâtus (Râkshasas).' 21, 104, VII.

† The whole 181st Chapter of 23 verses, Âdi Parva.

‡ *Argha* and *Arghya* is more the language of the followers of the Yajur-Veda, both the Dark and the Bright, than that of those of the Ṛig-Veda, who call the ceremony *Madhu-parka*. According to the followers of the Ṛig-Veda there are seven mentioned as deserving that honour, but no 'friend' figures among the seven; the Yajur-Vedins hold six to deserve the honour, both the Divisions making room for 'friend'. All, however, are unanimous in holding meat to be one of the essentials in the ceremony.

‖ 9 and 10, 3, IX, Âśvalâyana Śrauta Sûtra.

§ Chapter 3, Book VII.

premier priest of the Rig-Veda to the prince seated on a seat of gold in state, after the *abhisheka* ceremony has been performed by the priests of the Yajur-Veda. There is nothing corresponding to this Vedic ceremony in the *râja-sûya* as described in the Sabhâ-Parva, while there is no "first worship" in any of the Sacrificial Manuals. The (I) *argha-haraṇa* as we find it to-day must be laid at the door of the Kṛishṇa--worshipping Vaishṇavas, who looked on Kṛishṇa as the whole-incarnation of Vishṇu. To the same sect must be ascribed (II) the Jarâ-sandha episode, Kṛishṇa the whole-incarnation looking passively on the duel, and making his devotee Bhîma the sole sharer of the glory of having blotted the formidable Goliath of Magadha out of the book of the living The (III) baffling of the attempt to strip the princess *Pânchâlî* before the assembled kings and princes in the Hall Book, the (IV) humbling in the Forest Book of Dur-vâsas, who is generally painted as a great misanthrope, his proving a benefactor of the Kuntî in the Opening Book by conferring on her the five *mantras* being the only exception, the (V) revealing of the terror-inspiring form to escape the clutches of the Dhârta-râshṭras in the Negociations-Book, the (VI) identification through Vishṇu with the Supreme Spirit in the Bhîshma Book, the (VIII) defence of Arjuna, the dearest devotee, in the Karṇa Book, the (IX) going out of the way in pointing out the thighs of the valiant Dur-yodhana to Bhîma in the Mace Book, the (X) keeping of the Pâṇḍavas out of the camp, the sleeping warriors and children in which are said in the Massacre Book to have been massacred in cold blood by the vindictive son of Droṇa by virtue of the weapon bestowed on him by S'iva, who is always described by the Vaishṇavas as being second and subordinate to their Vishṇu, the (XI) saving of the foetus by causing the disc to revolve round the womb of the widowed daughter-in-law of Arjuna till her safe delivery in the Straw Book, thereby proclaiming to the world the immunity of a *bhakta* from the curses etc of even a Brahmin priest thoroughly versed in the Vedas and most faithfully observing the ritual taught by them, the (XII) sitting before Bhîshma till the setting in of the winter solstice, and the witnessing of his final

Twelve episodes traceable to Vaishṇavas.

departure from the world in the Counsel Book, for these and kindred episodes the Kṛishṇa-worshipping Vaishṇava alone must be held responsible.

Class system Vedic, caste system non-Vedic.

The Brahminical religion tolerated the system of class, not of caste. The latter is a close system, there being no door by which an outsider can get admission into a caste. A class system can never become a close system; good looks and money are the two forces to which a class, howsoever high and stiff, more or less readily throws open its doors. Vasanta-senâ and Madanikâ, the former a young and beautiful courtezan, the latter one of her female slaves, could, in mediaeval* ages, even in India, become lawful wives of two Brahmins; the lower, aye, the lowest blood had thus opportunities to mingle with even the highest. No attempt of the ignorant and selfish priest of to-day can ever succeed in establishing, to use the language of Sanskrit logic, 'the relation of identity' between the open class system of the Vedic or Brahminical religion of Ancient India, and the close caste system, which is not supported by any of the Scriptures, and which, in the nature of things, can not be more than 9 centuries old. The priest of mediaeval India was no doubt frightened when the word 'intermarriage' fell into his ears; but the intermarriage which unhinged his mind must have been that in which the class of the bridegroom was inferior to that of the bride, not the one in which it was superior to that of the bride, as the latter was of more or less frequent occurrence when he lived, and has been sanctioned by the House-holders'† Manuals forming the Scriptures of the three regenerate classes. For the former there is, no doubt, no sanction; but the point of there being no prohibi-

---

* The Mrichchakaṭika 'Toy-cart,' in which this state of things is described, is the earliest among the Sanskrit dramas extant.

† 'A Brahmin may take to wife a woman (of any) of the three classes (one his own and the two lower), a Kshatriya of the two classes (one his own and the one lower), a Vaiśya of the one class (his own); some (say) also a woman of the Śûdra class without the (recitation of the) Mantras.' 8-11, 4, I, Pâraskara Gṛihya Sûtra.

tion either ought to be remembered, as absence of positive prohibition is equivalent to tacit sanction. So, the intermarriage denounced in the writings of mediaeval ages in India must have been this one, not the other. The denunciation of intermarriage found in the body of the Mahâ-Bhârata of to-day ought therefore to be understood as having reference only to the *prati-loma sankara*, as the intermarriage is technically called, when the class of the bride is higher, not to the *anu-loma sankara* in which the bride-groom belongs to a class higher than that of the bride. The Brahmin priest of the 4th Christian century has explained away all such marriages by resorting to the expedient of placing a curse at their bottom, or to some expedient more or less clumsy to bridge over the supposed gulf between the two parties.

Ten hands traced in Mahâ-Bhârata.

In the voluminous and unwieldy Mahâ-Bhârata as presented to-day, one can therefore without much difficulty trace the hand of:—

1 The trans-Indus Ârya; *2* The cis-Indus Ârya whose brain being *Hellenised* could easily make a mortal woman the temporary mistress of a Vedic divinity; *3* the priest enamoured of the doctrine of the "non-destruction (of animal life)", as understood and taught by Budhists, or rather by Jains; *4* The Brahmin bard or priest exalting the Brahmin sages even above Vedic divinities; *5* the Kshatriya bard exalting the Kshatriyas at the expense of Brahmin sages and Vedic divinities; *6* The Brahmin priest fond of taking a leaf out of the Book of Samanism; *7* The Brahmin priest who thought that his ancestors by virtue of the *Mantras* had the power of bringing down any Vedic divinity on the earth; *8* The other priest who shuddered at the idea of a maiden of a higher class contracting marriage with one belonging to a class lower than her own; *9* The priest to whom the Vedic Ritual had become a complete blank, and who therefore misunderstood and misinterpreted things Vedic; *10* the Kṛishṇa-worshipping Vaishṇavas.

A critical edition of the whole of the Mahâ-Bhârata is a great desideratum. The oldest manuscripts ought to be collected and collated, which laborious work may have to be divided among about a dozen sub-editors under the direction and supervision of one general editor of ripe knowledge and scholarship. The sub-editors with the editor will have to work patiently for a number of years before sending the edition to the Press. Very little popular patronage is likely to be secured; but the Libraries and Learned Societies will, it is believed, welcome it. A heavy expenditure will have to be incurred; it will have to be met in the same way in which the expenses of the editions of 'The Sacred Books of the East' were met, that is, by opening a subscription list, and asking those who take interest in such subjects to subscribe liberally to the fund. But—*A Max Muller is badly wanted for such a work.*

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

ERRATA.

page	line	
11	21	read "to" for "fo"
15	21	read "a few" for "few"

Digitized with financial assistance from
Ms.Swati Thakar
on 13 March, 2020